

There is no additional fee for this Amendment because there are no more than three independent claims and the total number of claims is less than twenty.

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the referenced patent application, particularly in view of the above Amendment and the following remarks.

Amendment to the Claims

Applicant has amended Claim 1 to require that the air-conditioner components (23, 24, 25) are connected and wired with each other entirely within the receptacle space and distinct from the interior of the rack (10). Applicant urges that the above amendment is supported in the drawings in Fig. 2 and in the Substitute Specification at page 6, line 18 through page 7, line 3. Applicant has also cancelled Claims 2-4.

Drawing Objections

The Examiner has objected to the drawings for failing to comply with 37 C.F.R. §1.83(a) because the drawings do not show every feature of Claims 2-4. Applicant has cancelled Claims 2-4 thus rendering the objection moot.

Applicant's Claimed Invention

As amended, Applicant's claimed invention relates to an air-conditioned switchgear cabinet having a plurality of wall elements and at least one cabinet door, and an air-conditioner integrated in the cabinet door wherein the cabinet door (30) is designed as a tub-shaped housing for receiving a plurality of air-conditioner components (23, 24, 25) and delimiting a receptacle space adjoining an interior of a rack (10) in which the air-conditioner components (23, 24, 25) are connected and wired with each other entirely within the receptacle space for retrofitting the cabinet door (30) with the rack (10) separately from the interior of the rack (10). In addition, Applicant has claimed an air-conditioned switchgear cabinet having a plurality of wall elements and at least one cabinet door, and an air-conditioner integrated in the cabinet door wherein the cabinet door (30) delimits a receptacle space adjoining an interior of the switchgear cabinet and distinct from the interior of the switchgear cabinet; and the air-conditioner is integrated into the cabinet door (3), and the receptacle space of the cabinet door (30) houses components 23, 24, 25 of the air conditioner. Newly added Claim 6 further requires an open end of the cabinet door coextensive with an open end of the switchgear cabinet.

Claims Rejection - 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-4 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over Lyman et al., U.S. Patent 3,559,728, in view of Brossardt et al.,

U.S. Patent 5,184,879. This rejection is respectfully traversed, particularly in view of the above Amendment and the following remarks.

As amended, Applicant's claimed invention requires a tub-shaped housing for receiving a plurality of air-conditioner components (23, 24, 25) and delimiting a receptacle space adjoining an interior of a rack (10) in which the air-conditioner components (23, 24, 25) are connected and wired with each other *entirely within the receptacle space for retrofitting the tub-shaped housing separately from* the interior of the rack (10). In addition, in newly added Claim 5, Applicant's claimed invention requires the cabinet door (30) delimiting a receptacle space adjoining an interior of the switchgear cabinet and *distinct from* the interior of the switchgear cabinet. The Examiner alleges that the Lyman et al. patent teaches a cabinet and a hollow door containing a cover, air-conditioner components and/or a heat exchanger but does not disclose a hollow door having a tub shape. The Examiner alleges that the Brossardt et al. patent teaches a hollow door having a tub shape to increase storage capacity and improve aesthetics.

Applicant urges that, as amended, the claimed invention is not taught or suggested by the Lyman et al. patent and/or the Brossardt et al. patent. Applicant's claimed invention requires a cabinet door comprising a tub-shaped housing for receiving a plurality of air-conditioner components (23, 24, 25) and delimiting a receptacle space adjoining an interior of a rack (10) in which the air-conditioner components (23, 24, 25) are connected and wired with each other *are connected and*

wired with each other entirely within the receptacle space for retrofitting the cabinet door (30) with the rack (10) separately from the interior of the rack (10). This configuration enables cabinet doors to be separately constructed, delivered and installed as discussed in the Substitute Specification at page 6, line 18 through page 7, line 3.

In contrast, neither the Lyman et al. patent and the Brossardt et al. patent teach an integrated air conditioning system contained entirely within a separable cover. The Lyman et al. patent teaches a self-contained heat exchange unit having a plurality of vents 31, 22 extending between the unit and the cabinet. The Lyman et al. patent teaches coextensive vents 31, 22 that preclude a separate, retrofittable cover. The Lyman et al. patent also does not teach or suggest pre-wired air-conditioning components as taught by Applicant's claimed invention. The Brossardt et al. patent does not teach or suggest a separable cover for a control cabinet but instead teaches at line 18-21 of the Abstract that the air conditioning device extends into the interior of the control cabinet or flush with the control cabinet with the use of spacing elements. For the foregoing reasons, Applicant urges that Claims 1 and 5 are not taught or suggested by the Lyman et al. patent in view of the Brossardt et al. patent.

In addition, Claim 6 requires that an open end of the cabinet door is coextensive with an open end of the switchgear cabinet. Clearly neither the Lyman et al. patent nor the Brossardt et al. patent teach or suggest an *open end* of a cabinet door coextensive with an *open end* of a switchgear cabinet, resulting in a clamshell

like engagement between the retrofittable cabinet door and the switchgear cabinet. Such an open end mating arrangement is in direct contrast to the complex venting and attachment systems taught by the Lyman et al. patent and the Brossardt et al. patent.

Conclusion

Applicant believes that the above Amendment places all pending claims into condition for allowance. Applicant believes that the above Amendment and remarks are fully responsive to each and every issue raised by the Examiner; however, should the Examiner have any further issue, Applicant kindly requests the Examiner to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,



Kevin D. Erickson
Reg. No. 38,736

Pauley Petersen Kinne & Fejer
2800 W. Higgins Road
Suite 365
Hoffman Estates, IL 60195
(847) 490-1400
FAX (847) 490-1403